

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MYESHA MARIE QUARTERMAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

A147788

(Napa County
Super. Ct. No. CR178164)

Defendant and her companion were stopped by American Canyon police in a stolen vehicle, at a Wal-Mart parking lot. Each provided police with “fake stories” of how they came to possess the car. Found in defendant’s shoe were the vehicle owner’s driver’s license, Social Security card, and credit cards.

A complaint was filed on December 8, 2015, alleging one count of unlawful taking or driving of a vehicle (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), one count of receiving stolen property (Pen. Code,¹ § 496, subd. (a)), one count of receiving a stolen motor vehicle (§ 496d, subd. (a)), and one count of possession with intent to use another’s access card account information (§ 484e, subd. (d)), all felonies. As to all counts, it was further alleged defendant had suffered five prison priors within the meaning of section 667.5, subdivision (b).

Ten days later on December 18, defendant pleaded no contest to receiving a stolen motor vehicle in exchange for the dismissal of the other counts and special allegations.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

Pursuant to a negotiated disposition, the court later sentenced defendant to the upper term of three years and, pursuant to section 1170, subdivision (h)(5), split the sentence—two years to be served in county jail and the final year to be served under mandatory supervision.

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal “based on the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea that do not affect the validity of the plea.” A request for a certificate of probable cause was made, but we find no ruling on that request in the record. Counsel was appointed to represent defendant, and counsel filed a brief setting forth the facts of the case, but advising the court under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, no issues were found to argue on defendant’s behalf. Defendant was notified by her counsel she had 30 days to file a supplemental brief with the court. No supplemental brief has been received.

Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have examined the entire record ourselves to see if any arguable issue is present. We have reviewed the plea itself and find nothing deficient. Defendant pled no contest and there was a stipulation to a factual basis for the plea based upon the police report. She waived her rights in writing. Defendant’s negotiated plea was free and voluntary. We also find no meritorious sentencing issues requiring reversal of the judgment. The record does not indicate any deficiency in defendant’s representation by counsel. We therefore agree with defendant’s counsel that no issues are present that could undermine defendant’s no contest plea.

Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed.

Margulies, J.

We concur:

Humes, P.J.

Banke, J.

A147788
People v. Quarterman